

S 2722

I also associate myself with the Senator's remarks regarding reactivation of battalions.

I congratulate the Senator once again and thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, a senior member on the Armed Services Committee.

I am particularly gratified to find that he feels the same way I do, that continued military pressure on Hanoi is, in the last analysis, the best way to bring the not so little war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion.

NOMINATION OF RAMSEY CLARK TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for his excellent choice in nominating Ramsey Clark to be Attorney General of the United States. The President has sent to the Senate many outstanding nominations, but this is one of the best. Of course, it was not entirely unexpected that Ramsey Clark would be the President's choice, but it is good to have the nomination official.

Ramsey for some time, now, has served as Acting Attorney General as well as Deputy Attorney General, and he has proven himself well qualified to carry the heavy responsibility of this office.

He is a man dedicated to justice and the preservation of the rights of man. I have been particularly impressed by his actions in the area of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping. He is the first Attorney General actually to come to grasp with the total privacy problem as it is affected by wiretapping and electronic snooping. Too often in the past, Attorneys General have followed the course of least resistance and have failed to provide the leadership necessary to strengthen privacy.

In addition to his many other qualifications, Ramsey Clark is also a good administrator, as is shown by his record as Assistant Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. President, I know the Senate will give this nomination early consideration and that Ramsey Clark will soon be confirmed as the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, President Johnson has just announced his intention to appoint Ramsey Clark as Attorney General of the United States. Most of us in the Senate have had a chance to get to know Mr. Clark, and I think we can all agree that his appointment will be one of the finest any President has ever made.

President Kennedy appointed Ramsey Clark as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division of the Justice Department almost exactly 6 years ago. Mr. Clark did an outstanding job in this position, and in February of 1965 became Deputy Attorney General. He was instrumental in assisting the President and Attorney General Katzenbach in securing passage of such landmark legislation as the Voting Rights Act and the Law Enforcement

Assistance Act, and he had the opportunity to observe at first hand the difficult days of the Selma to Montgomery march and the awesome aftermath of the Watts conflagration. Since last October 3, Mr. Clark has been Acting Attorney General, and we have seen the mark of his work in the President's crime and civil rights programs and in yesterday's fine message on the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, this route to the Attorney Generalship—from Assistant Attorney General, to Deputy Attorney General, to Acting Attorney General—is the route which gave us Mr. Clark's predecessor, Nicholas Katzenbach, who did such an excellent job. It means we have a man with experience in the Department and with good relations on Capitol Hill. I look forward to Mr. Clark's quick confirmation, and to many more years of imaginative leadership in the Justice Department.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, word has just reached me that President Johnson has nominated Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark to become Attorney General. I hasten to congratulate the President on his choice and Mr. Clark on his nomination.

He brings to this Cabinet position a considerable amount of experience—over 10 years in the private practice of law; 6 years as an Assistant Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, and Acting Attorney General.

Mr. President, I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Clark well. He has demonstrated his devotion to the law. I am confident he possesses the leadership and the ability to meet the challenging responsibilities of the office.

THE CIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is criticized much too freely and at the slightest, flimsiest provocation, by all too many of our leading "opinion makers" in both public and private life.

The sputtering indignation of the past week over the fact that the CIA has been doing what it should do, would be amusing were it not illustrative of an appalling lack of understanding of the proper functions of an intelligence agency in a cold war situation.

For the CIA to help finance these various activities is not indicative of a diseased society.

It is rather a sign that a healthy society is taking the pragmatic action that is necessary to preserve itself in a difficult, demanding, and often tumultuous world.

I do not intend to speak at any length today, in defense of the CIA.

Rather, my purpose in making these brief comments is to introduce into the Record an article by Carl T. Rowan, entitled "In Defense of the CIA's Undercover 'Links'."

Mr. Rowan has had a distinguished career in Government and as a newspaperman. On the basis of his experience, he is better qualified than most to make a judgment on the Agency's assist-

ance in the financing of student, labor, and other private groups.

Mr. Rowan writes:

It must be reckoned one of the great public relations failures of American history that the CIA has not won acceptance for its clandestine activities on the valid ground that it is fighting the same deadly struggle as the FBI.

I agree fully with this accurate and tragic statement.

The feeling that the CIA can do no right is all too prevalent in our country today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this realistic and able article reprinted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CIA'S UNDERCOVER "LINKS"

(By Carl T. Rowan)

When the stream of criticism and contempt for the Central Intelligence Agency rolls so forcefully and resolutely, one risks all manner of accusations if he moves against the tide.

But move against it I must, for there are some tragic aspects of the furor over the CIA's financing student, labor and other private groups that have not been given adequate attention.

Surely I break no vows of secrecy made in my government days if I say now that this string of "exposés" of CIA associations can go on and on. There are dozens of yet unnamed groups that cooperated with CIA—simply because they believed it to be in their children's and the nation's interest.

I admire one of them—the Hobby Foundation of Houston, Texas—for publicly expressing pride in having cooperated.

The disciplines of self-acclaimed intellectualism, or liberalism, or idealism compel some people to deplore these private involvements in the dirty business of waging a cold war. They say the health of the nation requires that our press, universities, students et al remain "free of government manipulation."

I cannot understand the schizophrenia that has caused these purists to exempt the Federal Bureau of Investigation from criticism for so long. The FBI has its hand, and agents, in far more domestic organizations than the CIA. But somehow the press and the public have accepted that as necessary to trap those frightful spies and saboteurs.

It must be reckoned one of the great public relations failures of American history that the CIA has not won acceptance for its clandestine activities on the valid ground that it is fighting the same deadly struggle as the FBI.

As the tedious string of "revelations" unwinds, I conclude that American opinion-molders have become almost as psychotic about "the CIA" as those foreigners who talk as though the agency is capable of overthrowing their governments on five minutes' notice.

The harsh truth is that these exposures have destroyed the CIA as an effective instrument in many arenas of the cold war that is still being waged furiously, despite the recent talk about "detente." So what the Communists spent billions—unsuccessfully—to do, we Americans, out of our idealism, have delivered to them as a gift.

It disturbs me that this rush to bare CIA "links" has tainted "Crossroads Africa," the "American Society for African Culture," and other groups that have worked honestly and intelligently to keep alive in millions of Africans a faith and hope in democracy.

Sanctionious, theoretically correct arguments that "private business and industry" should have provided the funds demolish themselves against one hard fact: Business and industry had neither the interest, the attitudes nor the inclination to support these efforts properly.

It bothers me that these "revelations" have compromised, perhaps fatally in some cases, hundreds of young men and women who might have become leaders of the developing nations.

The wounds inflicted upon the Alliance for Progress are grave.

Many a U.S. Peace Corps worker or diplomat, and numerous foreign scholars and labor leaders who have struggled bravely in the cause of freedom, will have their integrity impugned and their futures jeopardized before this great expose fizzles out.

Sure, one can say the CIA built this colossal tragedy by wrongly involving all these peoples and groups in the first place.

I say nonsense. Several presidents, several cabinets, dozens of congressmen and the leaders of all the groups involved went into this business with their eyes wide open. And it wasn't because of an ugly assumption that the ends justify the means, as some idealists argue. They made a practical recognition of the fact that the adversary had already set the dirty rules of battle, so either we played by his rules or got our brains beaten out.

I can't find it in my journalistic heart to say the press is wrong to dredge up all it has about CIA "covers." Yet, I have an uneasy feeling that in pursuit of a hallowed bit of journalistic dogma, we are slaying some dragons that will come back to haunt our progeny.

I keep remembering President Kennedy saying to the American Newspaper Publishers Association in 1961:

"This nation's foes have openly boasted of acquiring through our newspapers information they would otherwise hire agents to acquire through theft, bribery or espionage . . .

"Today no war has been declared—and however fierce the struggle, it may never be declared in traditional fashion . . .

"If the press is awaiting a declaration of war before it imposes the self-discipline of combat conditions, then I can only say that no war ever posed a greater threat to our security."

Is it heresy for me to ask whether the benefits to "freedom" accruing from these exposures of the CIA are great enough to balance out the damage done to our security?

GREENLAND HALIBUT IS NOT NORTH PACIFIC HALIBUT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a situation that is unfair to the American consuming public and the cause of great damage to one of the Nation's important commercial fisheries is occurring today in the marketplace.

A product labeled as "Greenland" halibut is masquerading as true halibut in the fresh and frozen food cases of the Nation's food stores, despite the fact that the so-called Greenland halibut is not only inferior in taste and texture, but falls to an even greater degree in the nutritive values which have helped build a strong and stable market for the North Pacific-produced species. I have had considerable comment from the consuming public, who feel that they are being misled and cheated; and the method of merchandising the imported product is such that our own fishermen and industry are bearing the brunt of much of this assault.

I have in my possession numerous

newspaper advertisements promoting this inferior imported product. Some of them, it is true, use the term "Greenland," but in almost every case it is subjugated and nearly hidden, and a large number of others refer only to halibut. A survey of actual market showcases throughout the country by the American industry indicates that only the word "halibut" is being used, and the public is purchasing this inferior product, confident that they are receiving the high-quality and nutritious product to which they have long been accustomed. The situation must be halted by the Government agencies concerned.

For some 5 years now, the Halibut Association of North America has spent considerable sums of money and untold effort in building a market for the highly prized North Pacific halibut. Not only is the inferior imported product profiting from that effort, but they are doing untold damage, for the housewife will now be wary in her future fishery purchases.

As the result of heavy imports of "Greenland" halibut, the markets for our own Pacific Northwest product have been falling off to a point where holdings are now at a high and dangerous level. It is estimated that the value of the 1967 halibut catch from the North Pacific Ocean may be from \$6 to \$10 million dollars less than that of the 1966 catch.

There is no problem for the scientist to distinguish between these two species. The Greenland variety is called "Reinhardtius hippoglossoides." The true halibut—the one the housewife thinks she is buying—is called "Hippoglossus Stenolepis."

Mr. President, scientifically, these are different species, they are of different texture, taste, and quality, and the respective agencies of Government must act quickly not only for the protection of the consumer, but for the welfare of one of the west coast's oldest fisheries.

The International Pacific Halibut Commission, which exists under treaty between the United States and Canada, is one of the world's respected conservation agencies, and its record in maintaining these stocks at high level and the industry in a healthy economic climate, has come about only through decades of sacrifice by both fisherman and processor. To allow this great industry to face economic collapse and at the same time continue to mislead the American consumer is not only unthinkable, but must receive the immediate attention and action by the U.S. Government.

ARE YOU HOLDING UP THE U.S. MAIL?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all citizens desire speedy, efficient postal at a reasonable cost. They are entitled to that. The Post Office Department is perhaps one of the most criticized of all Government Departments and for the reason that it affects the daily lives of all Americans.

We sometimes lose sight of the fact that officials of the Post Office Department are doing their utmost to improve

the operation of their Department and to provide Americans with swift postal service. On February 16, 1967, the Wellston, Ohio, Telegram, published an excellent editorial entitled "Are You Holding Up the U.S. Mail?" urging readers of that newspaper to cooperate in ZIP coding their mail. In doing so, this newspaper performed a fine public service. I hope that other newspapers throughout the country will follow this example.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE YOU HOLDING UP THE U.S. MAIL?

The time has come for the public to be aware that Zip Coding in the U.S. mails is vitally important. The mails are swelling each year to the point that service rendered under the old system is slowing up deliveries.

Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien stated, "You can help your Post Office provide the finest and most efficient mail service in the world by joining in the Zip Code Campaign. Your support is vital to the success of this program. We are counting on your help."

Only about half of the letters mailed by individuals are now Zip Coded. Part of this is due to the fact that some people are not aware of its tremendous importance in the efficient handling of mail. Surely everyone has heard of Zip Code by this time. Some folks think of it as just a favor to the post office—something to do if they happen to think of it.

But the Zip Code is much, much more than that.

Zip helps our postal worker move mail the modern way. With Zip they can sort it faster and deliver it by more direct routes. With Zip they will use modern electronic machines that "read" Zip numbers and sort mail fifteen times faster than was possible before.

People who don't use Zip Code hold up the mail for themselves and for everyone else.

As long as the "Zip gap" exists, the Post Office must operate on both the old and the new systems, simultaneously. This cancels out many of the advantages inherent in Zip code.

When you plunk down a nickel for a stamp, you "should" get the world's most efficient postal service in return.

But—if you haven't added the Zip Code to the mailing address, you may not get all you are paying for. A single unzipped letter can slow up the mail at six post offices.

At Christmas-time, the post offices, including ours here in Wellston, issued cards asking the public to fill in the names and addresses of their correspondents and bring them back and they would supply the zip codes. How many did this? The response was not too great. Henceforth, things are in the "gap" stage here in Wellston.

So remember: Always add Zip Code to every address you write. If you do not know the number, call your post office or look it up in their Zip Code Directory.

Also remember to add your Zip Code to your return address too. That makes it easier for others to Zip their mail to you.

We're always growling about the postal service—but possibly we are to blame. Let's get the Zip Codes on our mail.

Mail moves the country—Zip Code moves the mail.

THE UNREST IN CHINA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the current unrest and chaos that are dominating Red China's political, social, and cultural life have been the focus of attention and